

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-29 stand rejected.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 12, 17-18, 23, and 28-29 are amended herein.

Claims 10, 13, 16, 22, and 26 are canceled herein.

Claims 1, 12, 17, 23, 28 and 29 are the only independent claims.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6, 10, and 12-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Seidel U.S. Patent No. 4,383,316 (hereinafter "Seidel").

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidel in view of Widmer U.S. Patent No. 5,648,776 (hereinafter "Widmer").

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidel in view of Morikura U.S. Patent No. 5,539,846 (hereinafter "Morikura").

Claims 9, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidel in view of Hutchison U.S. Patent No. 5,408,473 (hereinafter "Hutchison").

In view of these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, among other things:

periodically interspersing one or more training sequences into the first substream, wherein the one or more training sequences comprise a first marker signal and wherein the one or more training sequences are interspersed in the first substream at

an interval corresponding to a frequency of the stream of data.

Independent claims 12, 17, 23, 28 and 29 have been similarly amended. Support for these amendments may be found at least in Applicants' Specification at page 11, lines 16-24, page 12, lines 18-26, and FIGS 5A and 5B.

Seidel, as read by Applicants, does not appear to teach interspersing training sequences in substreams as claimed in independent claims 1, 12, 17, 23, 28 and 29. Therefore, regarding the § 102(b) rejection, Applicants submit that Seidel fails to teach or disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 1, 12, 17, and 23. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, 17, and 23, along with dependent claims 2-6, 14-15, 18-21, 24-25 and 27 is respectfully requested.

As noted above, Applicants submit that Seidel does not appear to teach interspersing training sequences in substreams. Widmer, Morikura, and Hutchison, as read by Applicants, do not appear to overcome the deficiencies of the Seidel reference. As such, neither Widmer, Morikura, nor Hutchison, when taken either alone or in combination with Seidel, teach, disclose, or suggest the limitations recited in amended claims 1, 12, 17, 23, 28 and 29 or dependent claims 2-9, 11, 14-15, 18-21, 24-25 and 27. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-29 is respectfully requested.

## II. CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe all the claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the same.

Applicants have attached a Request for Two Month Extension of Time to make this Response timely. If for any reason the attached Request is defective or does not meet a requirement of the Office, Applicants request that the Office accept this paragraph as a Request for Extension of Time and authorization to charge the requisite extension fee to Deposit Account No. 09-0465. Applicants do not believe any other fees are due regarding this amendment. If any other fees are required, however, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0465. The Applicants encourage the Examiner to telephone Applicants' attorney should any issues remain.

Respectfully Submitted,



Brian M. Dugan, Esq.  
Registration No. 41,720  
Dugan & Dugan, PC  
Attorneys for Applicants  
(914) 332-9081

Dated: October 17, 2006  
Tarrytown, New York